

REMARKS

1. In the above-captioned Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings. Claims 19, 21, 25, 27, 32, and 33, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Fegel (U.S. Patent No. 3,874,225). Claims 20, 22-24, 26, and 28-31, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Fegel. These rejections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.
2. The Examiner objected to the drawings. Replacement drawing sheets in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.121(d) are attached hereto. No new matter has been added to the replacement drawing sheets.
3. Claims 19, 21, 25, 27, 32, and 33, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Fegel. Prior to discussing the merits of the Examiner's position, the applicant believes it would be helpful to first briefly describe and characterize the Fegel reference.

THE FEDEL REFERENCE

As stated in Fegel:

The pressure tester 30 includes a tester body 32 having an outer portion 34 and having an external annular shoulder 36 seatable against an internal annular shoulder 37 in the cavity 16. The tester body 32 also has an inner portion 38 insertable into the cylindrical cavity 16 in the cylinder head 10, preferably an O-ring 40, engageable with the circumferential wall of the cylindrical cavity 16 adjacent the top end of the injector sleeve 22. [Column 3, lines 12-20].

Fegel therefore describes inserting a tester body into a cavity, wherein the tester body sealably engages a circumferential wall of the cavity for pressure testing of the cavity. Fegel does *not* describe use of a fuel injector in his test apparatus. Fegel does not and cannot test a fuel injector by mechanically isolating at least one test volume of the *fuel injector that is disposed within a sleeve* as stated in independent claims 19 and 32 as amended above.

Fegel does not teach a method for testing a *fuel injector*, nor any similar device as described above.

Hence, the applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 19 and 32, along with dependent claims 21, 25, 27, and 33 that depend therefrom may be passed to allowance.

4. Claims 20, 22-24, 26, and 28-31, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Fegel. For the sake of brevity, the Examiner's comments and arguments with respect to claims 20, 22-24, 26, and 28-31, except for those discussed above, have not been addressed herein because any arguments thereto would be needlessly repetitious, as the Examiner's comments and arguments appear to derive from the assumption that Fegel teaches or suggests mechanically isolating at least one test volume of a fuel injector that is disposed within a sleeve, which assumption was shown to be incorrect above. The resultant combination of the teachings of Fegel with what, according to the Examiner, is known in the art would not yield the invention as claimed.

Thus, the claims of the present invention are not taught or suggested by Fegel. Any combination based on this reference fails to teach or yield the invention as claimed and fails to teach or suggest all the elements of the claims. Further, one of skill in the art would not be motivated to make such a combination. Therefore, the present invention is not obvious in light of any combination based on Fegel.

Furthermore, claims 20, 22-24, 26, and 28-31 are dependent upon an independent claim that is shown to be allowable. For all these reasons, the dependent claims are themselves allowable.

5. No new subject matter is introduced by the amendments to the above claims and specification. The above change to claim 29 corrects a typographical error.

6. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication may advance the prosecution of the present application. Notice of allowance of claims 19-33 is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 11, 2006

By:



Elias P. Soupos
Registration No. 57,375
Agent for Applicant
Voice: (708) 865-4178
Fax: (708) 865-3474